

## REMARKS

The claims remaining in the present application are Claims 16-35.

## CLAIM REJECTIONS

### 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 16-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Szeliski et al., U.S. Pat. No. 6,009,190 (hereinafter, Szeliski) in view of Tice et al., U.S. Pat. No. 6,317,158 (hereinafter, Tice). Claims 16-23 are respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Currently Independent Claim 16 recites, “A method of processing an image for display on a display having sub-pixel display capability, said method comprising:

mapping a plurality of sub-pixels of said display to corresponding spatial regions of said image, wherein each sub-pixel of said display is mapped to a unique spatial region of said image;

accessing said image, said image sampled at a higher spatial resolution than the spatial resolution of said display;

for each sub-pixel, calculating an intensity value for said sub-pixel using only intensity information for a first color from said corresponding spatial region; and

rendering said image on said display, based on said calculated intensities.”

Applicant respectfully asserts that Szeliski fails to teach or suggest, “accessing said image, said image sampled at a higher spatial resolution than the spatial resolution of said display; for each sub-pixel, calculating an intensity value for said sub-pixel using only intensity information for a first color from said corresponding spatial region; and rendering said image on said display, based on said calculated intensities,” (emphasis added) as recited in Claim 16.

For example, at Col. 2 lines 59-60 Szeliski states that one of the main applications of Szeliski’s teachings is to construct large aerial and satellite photographs from a collection of images. Further, at Col. 4 lines 3-25, Szeliski teaches a way of constructing a texture map from a set of overlapping images using, among other things, pixel locations of the images.

Szeliski also teaches at Col. 4 lines 47-65, “composite pixel values are placed into corresponding pixel locations in the texture map using a color stenciling feature in a unique color identification tag is assigned ... to each pixel in the triangle” (emphasis added). As can be seen, one of the problems with large aerial and satellite photographs is that certain regions may be invisible. Therefore, Szeliski teaches a way of making the invisible regions more visible. For example, at Col. 29, lines 62-67 Szeliski teaches that the pseudocoloring/stenciling method is used for “propagating pseudocolor id tags of pixels in visible regions into nearby invisible regions.” (emphasis added) Note, that Szeliski makes no mention of subpixels. Also, Szeliski teaches propagating

rather than calculating. Further, Szeliski does not teach “said image sampled at a higher special resolution...”

Because of the type of problem that Szeliski is attempting to solve, there is no reason for “calculating an intensity value for said subpixels.” Further, there is nothing in Szeliski that mentions anything about “calculating an intensity value for said subpixels” let alone teaches or suggests “accessing said image, said image sampled at a higher spatial resolution than the spatial resolution of said display; for each sub-pixel, calculating an intensity value for said sub-pixel using only intensity information for a first color from said corresponding spatial region; and rendering said image on said display, based on said calculated intensities,” (emphasis added) as recited in Claim 16.

Tice fails to remedy the deficiency in Szeliski in that Tice does not teach or suggest “calculating an intensity value for said subpixels” let alone teach or suggest “accessing said image, said image sampled at a higher spatial resolution than the spatial resolution of said display; for each sub-pixel, calculating an intensity value for said sub-pixel using only intensity information for a first color from said corresponding spatial region; and rendering said image on said display, based on said calculated intensities,” (emphasis added) as recited in Claim 16. In fact, the Rejection does not even state that Tice teaches “accessing said image, said image sampled at a higher spatial resolution than the spatial resolution of said display; for each sub-pixel, calculating an intensity value for said sub-pixel using only intensity information for a first color from said

corresponding spatial region; and rendering said image on said display, based on said calculated intensities" (emphasis added). Therefore, the combination Szeliski and Tice fails to teach or suggest these limitations.

Because neither Szeliski nor Tice teach the claim limitations, the combination of Szeliski and Tice does not teach or suggest these claim limitations. For the foregoing reasons, Claim 16 is respectfully believed to be patentable over Szeliski and Tice. Applicants respectfully requests allowance of Claim 16.

Claims 17-23 depend from Claim 16, which is respectfully believed to be allowable for reasons discussed herein. Therefore Claims 17-23 are believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependencies.


CONCLUSION

In light of the above listed amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the rejected claims is requested. Based on the arguments and amendments presented above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 16-23 overcome the rejections of record. For reasons discussed herein, Applicants respectfully request that Claims 24-35 be considered by the Examiner. For reasons discussed in a previous response, Applicants respectfully submit that withdrawn claims 24-35 are patentable. Therefore, allowance of Claims 16-35 is respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner have a question regarding the instant amendment and response, the Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Dated: 11/9/, 2005

Respectfully submitted,  
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
John P. Wagner  
Reg. No. 35,398

Address: WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP  
Two North Market Street  
Third Floor  
San Jose, California 95113

Telephone: (408) 938-9060 Voice  
(408) 938-9069 Facsimile